

Torill Strand. Beyond What is Givens ad Givens (2005). Australian Research in Early Childhood Education (ISSN 1320-6648). Vol. 12, pp 99-109.

Please visit the publisher's website

<http://edu.monash.edu/research/irecejournal/issues.html>



BEYOND WHAT IS GIVEN AS GIVENS:

PROMISES AND THREATS OF SELF-REFLECTIVE RESEARCH

Torill Strand

ABSTRACT

Preliminary findings of an ongoing project on the social constructions of educational beliefs within early childhood education in Norway seem to go beyond the given conceptions of these beliefs. As a non-conformist ethos of anti-educational beliefs has been revealed, it may be taken that the project has succeeded in going beyond what is given as givens. Or should it rather be interpreted as an elegant way of legitimising the researcher's own interests and assumptions? Using the project as an example, this article argues for the necessity of performing self-reflective sociology, while pointing out the inescapable paradoxes, promises and threats of self-reference.

Keywords: self-reflective sociology, symbolic power, research ethos, educational beliefs, kindergarten

INTRODUCTION

In the same way as the French philosopher Jacques Derrida tongue-in-cheek asserts that 'I only have one language; it is not mine' (Derrida, 1998 p. 1), I would like to argue that 'we - as researchers in early childhood education - only have one epistemology; it is not ours.' The point of this playful deliberation is to question the ways in which research within early childhood education may be characterised as sublimated performances of symbolic power. The assumption is that research is never neutral: our research will inevitably intervene; both in the discourse of early childhood education and in the discourse on the educational discourse.

In 1992 Derrida gave a lecture at the University of Oslo (which was later revised and published (Derrida 1998) under the title 'Monolingualism of the Other; or, The Prosthesis of Origin'). Entering the jam-packed auditorium I waded through a sea of enthusiastic listeners who were happily sitting on the floor, leaning against the walls or crammed together in the doorways. I noticed a few grey-haired philosophers, linguists and sociologists, but mostly young students. Suddenly, out of the huge crowd by the back door, I heard a cheerful shout: 'Hi Torill!' It was little Hilde from my kindergarten, now grown into an eager first year university student, obviously enjoying herself as she stood squeezed together with a bunch of young, curious and engaged Derrida-listeners.

It was somewhat moving meeting Hilde that day. Not as a sign of the years passing by, finding myself among the middle-aged grown-ups. Rather by the gradual realisation, during our conversation immediately after the lecture, that Hilde had grasped something I just dimly

perceived. The discussion made me even more humble towards young people's good judgment, and even more curious about Derrida's project. What was his message? And do I as a researcher in early childhood education have any lessons to learn from him?

In this article I will not perform an exegesis of Derrida's philosophy. I will rather let some of his thoughts inspire my deliberation on the ways in which research on early childhood education is – and has always been – situated in the crossroads of non-reflective logic, utopian polemics and intellectual acrobatics. The focus is the role of the researcher as she or he is situated outside and inside the practices studied. The question is in which ways the researcher's beliefs may contribute to a distorted, limiting, or narrow description of early childhood education. The question however is not *whether*, but rather in which ways and to what extent, research in early childhood education may be characterised as 'symbolic violation' (Bourdieu 1991).

The first part of this article points at Derrida's appeal for the necessity of 'respecting the respect of the respectable' (Derrida, 1998 p. 40) with my own project on 'The Epistemology of Early Childhood Education' taken as an example for the performance of self-reflective sociology. Next, the paradox of self-reference is discussed, revealing the ways in which a showdown of symbolic violence is inevitably dependent on the use of symbolic power. Summing up, the last part of the article points at the inescapable paradoxes, promises and threats of self-reference.

RESEARCH AS INTERVENTION

When questioned about his message and the lessons to be learned, Derrida refuses to give a clear answer. In an interview with Francois Ewald he strongly rejects having ever had any 'fundamental project.' And adds: '...deconstructions, which I prefer to say in the plural, has no doubt never named a project, a method or a system. Especially not a philosophical system' (Derrida, 2001 p. 67). Nevertheless, it is possible to trace some intentions in Derrida.

FE One can put it another way: Is there a philosophy of Jacques Derrida?

JD No.

FE Therefore there is no message.

JD No message.

FE Is there anything normative?

JD Of course there is, there is nothing but (Derrida, 2001 p. 71).

Derrida thus admits everything being normative in Derrida. He rejects any fundamental project, any method, and any philosophical system. But he admits to continuously perform intervening deconstructions with the intention of turning our collective myths and fables upside down and inside out. In another interview he admits that '...deconstruction, I have insisted, is not *neutral*. It *intervenes*' (Derrida 1981:93). Richard Bernstein (1993) may therefore be right in claiming that Derrida's ethical-political horizon is a point of departure for understanding Derrida's writings, such as when he refers to western philosophy as white mythology (Derrida 1982), when he questions logocentrism (Derrida 1983), ethnocentrism (Derrida 1986), and any form of political dogmatism (Derrida 1994). Bernstein holds that Derrida's call is a call for responsibility. A claim in which Derrida seems to agree: '... what I am saying is not normative in the ordinary sense of the term [...]. What I have just suggested about responsibility points instead to a law, towards an imperative injunction to which one must eventually respond without a norm, without, at the present time, a presentable normativity or normality...' (Derrida, 2001 p. 71).

Derrida's ethical-political horizon thus influences his deconstructions of ethics and politics. But deconstructions also stand out as ethical-political actions aiming at intervention and critique: The point is to deflate any doctrine - ethical, political or epistemological - as they may undermine or hinder 'the respect of the respectable' (Derrida, 1998 p. 40). This may be the reason why Derrida so strongly rejects having a project; because the commitment to a project presupposes recognition of some kind of doctrine. But in which ways may Derrida's call challenge research on early childhood education?

'I only have one language; it is not mine.'

The opening phrase in Derrida's lecture – 'I only have one language; it is not mine' - is autobiographical (Derrida, 1998 p. 1). Growing up as a French Jew in Algeria, Derrida learned to speak neither Yiddish nor Arabic. He went to a French school, and French was the only language spoken in his family. The monolingualism made him a solitary child; a stranger to Arab playmates and the Jewish community alike. Even towards the French culture, he felt like a foreigner. As a French citizen he learned to speak, think, play, work, communicate, and live his life through the French language. But he was neither inside nor outside the French, but rather on its outer edge. The experience of being on the boundary was amplified when he, as a 19-year old first year university student, for the very first time visited France. He was highly surprised, and to some extent offended by the way the Parisian students used and abused the language. He even felt upset by the manner in which they twisted and distorted it: 'Yes, I only have one language, yet it is not mine' (Derrida, 1998 p. 2).

In the same way as Derrida, I venture to say that I – as a researcher – only have one epistemology, yet it is not mine. As a researcher I have used a socio-pragmatic epistemology to examine the ways in which educational beliefs – the epistemology of Norwegian early childhood education – are socially generated, sustained and justified through social practices and positioning. I found that Charles Sanders Peirce's pragmatism in combination with Pierre Bourdieu's socio-cultural theory of practice provided an excellent tool for performing a sophisticated analysis. Peirce and Bourdieu both underline the unity of thought and action, they both use the notion of *habit(u)s* when describing the ways in which meaning is closely related to everyday experience, and they both maintain that the epistemology must be regarded as '*common sense*' and '*social practice*.'

The term *habit(u)s* denotes a set of culturally acquired dispositions that generate and structure social practices and representations, including 'scientific' ways of thinking and acting: Our world-view, belief system, values and ways of thinking and acting are all products of our *habit(u)s*. As a modernist, Peirce explicitly questions the fact that *habits* often function as a guiding principle for scientific practices. He points to the problem that new knowledge can only be generated through progressive breach of conventional ways of thinking. Despite the fact that he acknowledges *habits* as fruitful tools in a continual development of knowledge, he stresses the need to play by *chance*; to perform a type of discontinued ruptures, resulting from radical breaks with traditional and conformist ways of thought (Anderson 1987, Peirce 1877, 1903). *Habitus* is also a key concept for Bourdieu, and a tool with which to analyse the sociological and the socio-cultural production of knowledge (Bourdieu 1977, 1980, 1997). However, as scientific knowledge is also inevitably a social product, generated through the dialectic relationship between the research object and the subject performing the research, Bourdieu points out the danger of the researcher projecting her own prejudices, intermingling her own interests with those of the object. He thus calls for a systematic self-reflection in order to break with habitual ways of seeing (Bourdieu 1988, 1990, 1992). Research on early childhood education should therefore be self-reflective, as a systematic self-reflectivity is the only way to avoid conventional thinking.

EPISTEMOLOGICAL VIGILANCE

My habit(u)s as a Norwegian early childhood educator has undoubtedly effected my way of performing research. My personal and intellectual biographies, my educational beliefs, my prejudices, my personal style and interests have influenced the framing and description of the epistemology – or epistemologies – of early childhood education in Norway. Taking the fact that I am embedded in, and to some degree spokesperson for, some epistemological cultures and traditions it is pertinent to ask to what degree my object of study has been a projection of my own intentions, interests and aspirations. As a trained pre-school teacher with teaching experience from the kindergarten, and as a lecturer at Oslo University College teaching student teachers, I certainly speak the language of Norwegian early childhood education. However, when performing professional research seeking non-conventional knowledge of Norwegian early childhood education, that language should not be the only language to use. In order to demystify the collective myths I – as an agent in the field – am myself embedded in, upholding and legitimising, I need to disrupt my habitual practices and representations. Without being able to perform epistemic ruptures, my research work will never be able to go beyond what is given as givens.

This is Bourdieu's argument, when he calls for epistemological vigilance through a systematic 'reflection on reflection' (Bourdieu 1990). For him, the aim is to limit the damages of a narrowing vision and to take our blind spots seriously: because the ways we see define what we see, and we are able to see only when we understand that there is something we cannot see. Bourdieu thus wants to differentiate between practical knowledge and scientific knowledge, or in other words, between habitus-based practices as object of study and the researcher's non-habitus based research (Bourdieu 1992). Following Bourdieu I thus needed to take into account both types of knowledge; the one as a type of practical knowledge which was the object of my study and the other as a basis for my research work.

However, since my object of study was not entirely 'the other's' habitus-based practices, but rather a constructed object which came into being through a dialectic relationship between me and my object, my habit(u)s was inevitably part of the construction. I therefore needed to do my best to liberate myself from my culturally based judgements through a systematic self-reflection, using the theoretical and methodological tools on myself, my social position and my habitual ways of seeing (Bourdieu 1988, 1992). First, I endeavoured to look objectively at my own social *position* – as I found myself situated both inside and outside the social field studied – by considering the social field which defines both my position and my interpretation of this position. Second, I had to look objectively at my own *intentions* by applying such objectivity – meaning the intention of performing quality research according to some external standards – and at the same time try to avoid the temptation to use the latent power intrinsic in my academic language and scientific knowledge. Third, my possibility to limit myself from my own prejudices depended on the degree of objectivity with which I was able to look at the *interests* that had formed my academic career, my position within the academic milieu and my research practice, meaning the social forces and desires influencing my academic and personal biographies. When I endeavoured to expose my own research interests, the exposition included the habit(u)s implicit in my choice of theoretical perspective, approach and methods, as well as the ethical and political interests I had inherited through my social positions within, outside and in between the social fields of early childhood education and academia.

The aim with this systematic self-reflection was to limit the symbolic violation performed by my research and avoid the danger of concealing the epistemologies of Norwegian early

childhood education. I wanted to reveal some hidden logics of practice and to demystify some collective myths and fables. My self-reflective sociology may therefore to some extent be characterised as an emancipating project, aiming at unveiling the social production, performance and reproduction of symbolic power. However, several contradictions popped up: first, a showdown of dominant epistemologies necessarily had to be based on a constructed dualism between a strictly scientific rationale and a habitus-based epistemology, a dualism which may seem deceptive. Second, a deflation of the symbolic power of research inevitably had to be based on the power potential within the language and methods of research: my systematic procedures of epistemological vigilance could therefore easily be transformed into epistemological violence. Thus it seemed impossible to foresee ways of avoiding the abuse of symbolic power.

When it comes to the impossible distinction between habitus-based practices as the object of study and the researcher's non-habitus based research, Bourdieu is inspired by the French philosopher Gaston Bachelard. Bachelard calls for science to break with common sense: in quality research, habitual and non-reflective logics and languages of practice are translated and transformed into the logics and languages of science. He holds that these transitions from everyday language to a language of research amount to radical epistemological breaks that may overcome some epistemological obstacles (Bachelard 1968, Bourdieu, Chamboredon and Passeron 1991, Tiles 1984). As such, the discourse of research presupposes some epistemic ruptures. The very same concern is found in Peirce, as he calls for individual, private and habitual beliefs to be adjusted and validated through the consensus of the inquiring community (Apel 1995). Nevertheless, the language of science is inevitably influenced by tradition and culture, and will always reflect habitual ways of thinking and acting (Bachelard 1964, Bourdieu 1988, Peirce 1877). The concepts, theories, techniques and values of research will thus unavoidably mirror common world-views, values, and ways of categorising. Consequently, Peirce stresses the preliminary and fallible character of scientific knowledge as 'objective descriptions' are never given, but rather an ideal to strive for. Accordingly, Bachelard and Bourdieu state systematic self-reflectivity as a necessary condition for research. In order to go beyond what is given as givens, considerate research should always be paired with vigilant self-reflectivity. In sum, Bachelard, Bourdieu and Peirce point to the impossible distinction between everyday language and the language of research: on the one hand, social research should break with common sense and habitual beliefs. On the other hand, common sense and habitual beliefs are inevitably embedded in the logics and language of research.

THE IMPOSSIBLE PARADOXES OF SELF-REFERENCE

It is thus pertinent to ask to what degree a showdown of symbolic violence has to be based on – and thus accept – symbolic power. To what degree will emancipatory social research, that is research aiming at exposing abuse of symbolic power, in fact be dependent on such abuse itself? Taking my own project as an example, I have deliberately '... armed myself with reason' (Bourdieu, 1990 p. 32) in order to put every aspect straight. In order to do my very best to avoid some sublime performances of symbolic power I included a systematic self-reflective procedure in the project design.

The design consisted of four phases, each phase representing different levels of analysis. In the first phase I first wrote a self-reflective essay on my research interest, my social position, assumptions and expected findings. Then, based on Pierre Bourdieu's theory of practice, I thoroughly constructed a notion of the social field in which the educational beliefs of early childhood education are continuously generated and justified. Based on a hypothesis that the

syllabuses at the nineteen Teacher's University Colleges in Norway represent the canonised – or in other words, recognised and authorised – beliefs, I created a database on the compulsory reading lists from every Teacher's University College in two different years of study. The reading lists gave access to the topographical productions and distributions of the current epistemology, the issues at stake, and the most influential social agents and institutions. In short, I found that the teachers/lecturers at the Teacher's University Colleges produce most of the current epistemology. Also there appeared to be a clear demarcation between this field and other fields of knowledge, as I found an extended exchange of literature between the colleges, but relatively little import from other national and international fields.

In the second phase of the research, I aimed at a more nuanced description of the field, the themes and the positioning by interviewing the current 'prophets'. In order to analyze systematically my own contribution, I was also interviewed by the same interview guide as the 'prophets.' The 'prophets' interviewed were the most read authors, i.e. the authors who verbalised the most recognised beliefs. The 'prophets' were both men and women. Their intellectual biographies, their conceptions of qualitative early childhood education, and their utopias and dystopias on behalf of the field confirmed the relatively weak social position of this field compared to a larger field of knowledge. Despite the great differences between them, most of the prophets had entered the field from external fields, and used this field as a field of possibilities. They were all aware of how their books contribute to define and preserve the current epistemology. In sum the prophets were quite clever at playing the game of early childhood education, meaning the play about the content, the limits, and the rules of the game. Concerning the epistemology, I found no central themes or consistent universal beliefs. However, reading the findings against educational policy, traditions and culture, it seemed that the field is producing and constituted by a common interest in children's upbringing and a stance against 'schooling.' In this way, the canonised beliefs seem to be constructed by and legitimised through a non-conformist ethos of child-centred anti-educational beliefs.

The third phase was based on the assumption that the 'opponents,' contrary to the prophets, might reveal a more detached view of the game played within the field, and the collective myths defining, and defined by, this game. The 'opponents' were the less read textbook authors, speaking the language of Norwegian early childhood education as they were either trained as pre-school teachers or teaching/lecturing in one of the Teacher's University Colleges. The 'opponents' were all women. In short, they questioned the viability of the field, picturing it as a marginalised, alienating, or threatened field of knowledge. One opponent asserted that in a few years the Teacher's Colleges will be closed down, as there will be no need for specialised pre-school teachers. Another questioned the way in which the field monopolised certain alienating types of knowledge by demarcating boundaries between a literary and a popular way of thinking. A third maintained that the traditional feminine, harmonising and family-oriented nurturing logic produced and upheld by the field represents a great internal threat, as it may undermine the possibility of change, development and progress.

The point of the fourth phase was to test the results by systematically analyzing and questioning my role as researcher and the preliminary findings of the project. Here, I performed an exploring focus group interview, where the 'prophets' met the 'opponents'. I also systematically analysed the self-reflective text written in the first phase and the interview of myself performed in the second phase. Among other things, I told the interviewer that my utopian image of the field was the opposite of a 'secret cloister garden,' in which the activities are hidden behind high walls and narrow gates meant to close the world outside, because '... those enclosed discourses are very negative, they can become quite destructive after a while.' The focus group confirmed the image of a somewhat detached field and agreed on the

assumption that the common ‘mythology’, such as the myth of ‘the better childhood,’ ‘the professional pre-school teacher,’ or ‘teaching as a call,’ is a way of upholding the field and keeping it together.

In evaluating the project’s data I found: first that the social game of Norwegian early childhood education is about demarcating the field from other social fields of education; second that the social game seems to be about generating a collective belief in the game; third that the basis of the epistemology thus seems to be nothing more than this common belief itself. Thus, the ethos of Norwegian early childhood education comes forward as a defiant rebellion against other ways of educational beliefs and practices. Next, the interior demarcation between ‘we’ and the ‘other’ seems notably significant together with a conformist approval of the collective beliefs in the game. Consequently, my findings go beyond the common assumption that Norwegian early childhood education first of all is based on a romantic notion of the child, paired with progressive educational beliefs. On the contrary, they seem to verify that the field is based on, upheld by, and continuously strengthening a non-conformist, rebellious ethos of anti-educational beliefs. However, it is pertinent to question to what degree the findings reflect and confirm my own interests and assumptions.

By including a systematic self-reflection – or a ‘reflection on reflection’ – as a part of the project I attempted to carry out a responsible, reliable research as I did my very best to avoid using or abusing symbolic power. But to what degree is it possible to disentangle from the paradoxes of self-reference? When, in this project, I refer to my private and intellectual biography, my social position, my personal and professional interests, and myself, I can never be sure that my self-reference is beyond suspicion: that it does not contribute to undermining rather than strengthening the project. First, the act of employing the research tools on myself is likely to be conceived – by people concerned with distance, objectivity and traditional scientific endeavour – as a narcissistic, rebellious, non-scientific, or non-conformist rejection of the common rules and procedures of research. Second, my self-reflection may also be read as an attempt to diminish the critique of my own project. Third, such a systematic self-reference may also undermine the reliability of the project by diverting the attention towards less important elements. Consequently, my systematic self-reference may therefore be read as an example of the impossible paradoxes of self-reference, as the intention to act with epistemological vigilance may easily be turned upside down and inside out.

‘We never speak only one language...’

It seems like an inescapable dilemma that we, in our wish to avoid the misuse of symbolic power, often experience the ways in which epistemological programs and procedures contribute to conceal, rather than reveal, the object studied. Consequently, it seems impossible to calculate the possibility of avoiding symbolic power, as the programmatic call for epistemological vigilance may easily hinder or deflate the ‘...respect of the respectable’ (Derrida, 1998 p. 40).

In his lecture in Oslo in 1992 Derrida claimed that ‘I only have one language; it is not mine’ (Derrida, 1998 p. 1). As a French citizen growing up in Algeria he learned only French. He was monolingual. Even so, he did not consider the French spoken in France as his mother tongue. In the same way, many of us may in fact claim that we are monolingual. Nevertheless, despite the fact that we are monolingual, we are naturally able to speak several languages. For on the one hand it is true that we are monolingual. At the same time, it is a fact that ‘we never speak only one language’ (Derrida, 1998 p. 10), as language denotes belonging to, and for some identification with, a community, a group, a culture, or a nation. And as social agents inscribed in complex and multilayered social settings, most of us actually belong to a number of ‘language’ communities: already as small children we easily move in and out of various

social contexts and forms of practices. Take the example of the four-year-old who easily copes with the various forms of practices at home, in the day-care centre and with grandma.

In other words, Derrida believes that we never speak only one language. As a child and a teenager Derrida was monolingual. But the assertion that he spoke only one language is rather misleading. It is true that he only spoke French; nevertheless he was neither within nor without the French. He was on the outer edge; between Yiddish and French, Arabic and French, between the colonialist and the colonised. He was familiar and a stranger; he was a hostage and a guest. On the one hand, the French language represented a demand for traditionalism and conformism; on the other hand a possibility of change and the crossing of boundaries. Accordingly, French – whether it was about language, culture or citizenship – simultaneously represented a limitation and a possibility.

In other words, language should be conceived as a unique place and a unique starting point representing limitations and possibilities, hindrances and openings, threats and promises. Because, as Derrida says: ‘...one cannot speak of language except in that language’ (Derrida, 1998 p. 12), and in this he uses his own story as an example. When claiming that on the one hand he is monolingual and on the other hand speaks many languages, Derrida is telling his life story. In this, the French language – as a tool – was a unique place and starting point. But by telling his story he is in fact not only creating his own autobiography, but also our understanding of his biography. As such he actively intervenes in the world; not only in his own biography, but also in our understanding of his biography. Our new knowledge of his life influences our understanding of our own. Consequently he also intervenes in our biographies. His story is in no way neutral. It intervenes, both in his life and ours.

In the same manner, my research on early childhood education cannot be neutral because it will inevitably intervene: both in the discourse of Norwegian early childhood education, and in the discourse on the discourse. My epistemology is in fact the only tool I have, as it is impossible to describe an epistemology other than through this epistemology. Or, to paraphrase Derrida: ‘...one cannot have knowledge about knowledge except through that knowledge.’ In this way, my research on early childhood education is a discourse on the discourse that may both become a promise and a threat.

THE INESCAPABLE PARADOXES, PROMISES AND THREATS OF SELF-REFERENCE

As my research on the epistemologies of early childhood education is producing a discourse on the discourse, I must be epistemologically vigilant. The point is to avoid my un-reflected logic, utopian polemic or intellectual acrobatics to influence or overshadow the epistemologies studied. But as it seems impossible to untangle myself from my own un-reflected logic of practice, an objective description becomes an impossible ideal. Another problem is that a deflation of symbolic violence necessarily has to be based on the acceptance and use of symbolic power. In other words, an epistemological vigilance – in the shape of an epistemological doctrine and a systematic self-reflective procedure – may just as well hide as illuminate the epistemologies studied. On the whole, it seems rather impossible to avoid symbolic violation.

It is however important to emphasise that an epistemological vigilance not only represents a threat, but also a promise. Our epistemology, whether representing a ‘habit(u)al’ understanding or a ‘scientific’ understanding, is the only language we share. On the one hand it is impossible to describe an epistemology without that epistemology. It is impossible to produce knowledge other than through that knowledge. On the other hand we have many epistemologies and wide-ranging knowledge. For in the same manner as I am situated within,

outside and between early childhood education and academia, my epistemology will necessarily be able to move elegantly and self-assuredly within, outside and between the academia and my profession. My epistemology – and my epistemologies – thus represents both many limitations and many possibilities. On the one hand, it is a problem that I blindly support an epistemological program, or perform a one-sided intellectual acrobatic in terms of a formal procedure to ensure that I do not commit abuse of power. On the other hand, it is my epistemology – or epistemologies – that provides the only possibility I have to transcend and change, and thus to create a reliable discourse on the discourse within Norwegian early childhood education.

It is in other words, as Derrida says, exactly ‘...the respect of the respectable’ that is at stake, and such reliability or credibility cannot solely be secured through an epistemological doctrine, an intellectual procedure or a methodological acrobatic. On the contrary, Derrida believes that when reliability is challenged, we are challenged to the opposite, as the experience of being considered as reliable is to experience the impossible. The impossible paradox of unbiased research is the fact that being true to one’s own beliefs presupposes openness towards other ways of knowing. Derrida thus argues for an ethical-political commitment to a double, paradoxical and conflicting logic. Consequently, reliable research cannot simply be a question of technique or formal procedures. Rather, ‘...certain ‘madness’ *must* watch over each and every step ... as reason does also’ (Derrida, 2001 p. 72). Logic of irresponsible responsibility must therefore go together with a rational thoughtfulness, as we can never in advance guarantee that our dedication to an epistemological reliability will contribute to reliable research results. In other words, we have to commit ourselves to hospitality, acceptance, and deep respect of the object studied. Or, as Derrida expressed at the University in Oslo in 1992; this is about ‘respecting the respect of the respectable.’ But at the same time, he emphasised that there are no neutral standards here. There are no mutual goals provided by a neutral third party, because this type of respect, this type of hospitality, has to be created anew each time. And precisely therefore a certain madness, a dedication to an irresponsible responsibility must watch over each and every step in our research practice. In fact, certain madness must watch over our thinking alongside with reason.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, Douglas R. (1987) *Creativity and the Philosophy of C. S. Peirce*. Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Apel, Karl-Otto (1995) *Charles S. Peirce. From Pragmatism to Pragmaticism*. New Jersey: Humanity Press.
- Bachelard, Gaston (1964) *The Psychoanalysis of Fire*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Bachelard, Gaston (1968) *The Philosophy of No. A Philosophy of the New Scientific Mind*. New York: The Orion Press.
- Bernstein, Richard J. (1993) Serious Play. The Ethical-Political Horizon of Derrida. In: Richard J. Bernstein (ed): *The New Constellation. The Ethical-Political Horizons of Modernity/Postmodernity*. MIT Press, Cambridge Mass. pp. 172 – 198.

- Bourdieu, Pierre (1977) *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1980) *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1988) *Homo Academicus*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1990) *In Other Words. Essays Towards a Reflexive Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1991) *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1992) The Practice of Reflexive Sociology. In: Bourdieu & Wacquant (eds): *Invitation to a Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, pp 217 – 264.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1997) *Pascalian Meditation*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, Jean-Claude Chamboredon & Jean-Claude Passeron (1991) *The Craft of Sociology. Epistemological Preliminaries*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Derrida, Jacques (1981) *Positions*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Derrida, Jacques (1982) ‘White Mythology. Metaphor in the Text of Philosophy’. In: Derrida, Jacques (ed.): *Margins of Philosophy*. New York: Harvester Press, pp. 207 - 271.
- Derrida, Jacques (1983): ‘The Principle of Reason: The University in the Eyes of its Pupils’. *Diacritics* 13, no 3 (1983), pp. 3 – 20.
- Derrida, Jacques (1986): ‘Racisms’ Last Word’. *Critical Inquiry* 13 (autumn 1986), Pp. 140 – 70.
- Derrida, Jacques (1994) *Spectres of Marx: The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning and the New International*. London: Routledge.
- Derrida, Jacques (1998) *Monolingualism of the Other OR The Prosthesis of Origin*. Stanford University Press, Stanford.
- Derrida, Jacques (2001) ‘A certain ‘madness’ must watch over thinking’. In: Gert Biesta & Denise Egéa-Kuehne (eds.): *Derrida and Education*. London: Routledge, pp. 55 – 76.
- Peirce, Charles Sanders (1877) The Fixation of Beliefs. In: *The Essential Peirce. Selected Philosophical Writings. Vol. 1 (1867 – 1893)*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. pp. 109 – 123.
- Peirce, Charles Sanders (1903) Harvard Lectures on Pragmatism. In: Houser et al: *The Essential Peirce. Selected Philosophical Writings. Vol. 2 (1893 - 1913)*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. pp. 133 – 241.

Tiles, Mary (1984) *Bachelard: Science and Objectivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

AUTHOR

Name, title, affiliation, specialization and e-mail address.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This article is a revised version of a paper presented at “Reconceptualizing Early Childhood Education: Research, Theory and Practice,” 10th Conference in New York, October 2001.